DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 352 TM 003 968

AUTHOR	Goodwin, William L., Comp.
TITLE	Evaluation Instruments for Research Training Programs.
INSTITUTION	Colorado Univ., Boulder. Lab. of Educational Research.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[73]
NOTE	56p.; For related documents, see TM 003 967-973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Doctoral Programs; *Educational Researchers; *Graduate Students; Internship Programs; *Interviews; *Questionnaires; *Tests; Training Laboratories

ABSTRACT

This document contains instruments used in the yearly evaluations of the Laboratory for Educational Research (LER) of the University of Colorado between 1966 and 1970. It also includes the instruments used for the summer 1973 LER Summative Evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of this research training program according to the perceptions of different audiences. The instruments included questionnaires and interviews forms which were administered to past and present students of the LER program, faculty of the school of education, faculty of LER, and clients of LEP. (Author/SE)

ED 096352

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALUATION INSTRUMENTS

FOR RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAMS

TM 003 968

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCERD Reporting Form — Developmental Products

1. Name of Product	2. Laboratory or Center	3. Report Preparation
Evaluation Instruments for Research Training Programs	Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado	*Date prepared* 11/30/73 *Reviewed by* W.L. Goodwin

4. Problem: *Description of the educational problem this product designed to solve.*

A requirement to evaluate the effectiveness of research training programs according to the perceptions of different audiences.

5. Strategy: *The general strategy selected for the solution of the problem above.*

1. Evaluation instruments were developed and utilized by LER staff and fellows.
2. When and if reused, particular items were subject to revision.

6. Release Date: *Approximate date product was (or will be) ready for release to next agency.*	7. Level of Development: *Characteristic level (or projected level) of development of product at time of release. Check one.*	8. Next Agency: *Agency to whom product was (or will be) released for further development/diffusion.*
December, 1973	X *Ready for critical review and for preparation for Field Test (i.e. prototype materials)* ___ *Ready for Field Test* ___ *Ready for publisher modification* ___ *Ready for general dissemination/diffusion*	NIE

10-71-A (D)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. **Product Description:** *Describe the following; number each description.*

- 1. *Characteristics of the product.*
- 2. *How it works.*
- 3. *What it is intended to do.*
- 4. *Associated products, if any.*
- 5. *Special conditions, time, training, equipment and/or other requirements for its use.*

1. A series of evaluation instruments.

2. Administered to selected audiences for written reaction to or, in some cases, oral reaction via structured interview.

3. Provide data bearing on the effectiveness of the research training program.

4. None.

5. In their present form, these are very rough instruments with no available supporting data bearing on validity or reliability.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. Product Users: *Those individuals or groups expected to use the product.*

Agencies and institutions engaged in research and evaluation training.

11. Product Outcomes: *The changes in user behavior, attitudes, efficiency, etc. resulting from product use, as supported by data. Please cite relevant support documents. If claims for the product are not yet supported by empirical evidence please so indicate.*

1. See previous evaluations filed with USOE on the effectiveness of the LER training program.

2. Additionally, see the Laboratory of Educational Research (LER) 1966-1973 report released December, 1973, in which certain of these evaluation instruments were utilized.

12. Potential Educational Consequences: *Discuss not only the theoretical (i.e. conceivable) implications of your product but also the more probable implications of your product, especially over the next decade.*

Improved effectiveness of research and evaluation training activities.

13. Product Elements: *List the elements which constitute the product.*	**14. Origin:** *Circle the most appropriate letter.*
Evaluation Instruments.	(D) M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D M A
	D = Developed M = Modified A = Adopted

15. Start-up Costs: *Total expected costs to procure, install and initiate use of the product.*

Variable but quite minimal

16. Operating Costs: *Projected costs for continuing use of product after initial adoption and installation (i.e., fees, consumable supplies, special staff, training, etc.).*

See 15.

17. Likely Market: *What is the likely market for this product? Consider the size and type of the user group; number of possible substitute (competitor) products on the market; and the likely availability of funds to purchase product by (for) the product user group.*

Uncertain.

Table of Contents

Document 1: Instruments Used in the 1966-67 LER Evaluation Report

Document 2: Instruments Used in the 1968-69 LER Evaluation Report

Document 3: Instruments Used in the 1969-70 LER Evaluation Report

Document 4: Instruments Used in the Summer, 1973 LER Summative Evaluation

DOCUMENT 1

Instruments Used in the 1966-67 LER Evaluation Report

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LER STUDENTS: 1966-67

I. Evaluation of the Core Curriculum

Your evaluation of the core courses that you have completed will provide the stimulus and support for proposed revisions. Please be candid.

Make your evaluation in terms of the objectives of the Graduate Research Training Program. Place your rating to the left of the course number on the adjacent form.

The course is:
Rating Code:

- A: essential
- B: highly desirable
- C: desirable, but other not-required courses would be equal in value
- D: not as valuable as other possible electives
- E: of little or no value
- I: poor rating resulting from the quality of the instruction rather than the course content per se.

The required courses are listed below along with the student evaluations. It is important to bear in mind that these courses were evaluated with respect to their contribution to the objectives of the Graduate Research Training Program and not in relation to the students' own objectives or those of other students in the University.

Ratings

A B C D E I

Education

480-3 Elementary Statistical Methods

503-2 Advanced Psychological Foundations

505-3 Intermediate Statistical Methods

511-3 Advanced Educ. Measurement & Eval.

516-2 Advanced Soc. Found. of Educ.

591-3 Eval. of School Systems & Programs

600-2 Methods of Educational Research

604-3 Exp. Design and Analysis I

605-3 Exp. Design and Analysis II

608-0 Internship in Educ. Research I

609-0 Internship in Educ. Research II

610-0 Internship in Educ. Research III

611-0 Internship in Educ. Research IV

700-4 Masters Thesis

Psychology

587-4 General Statistics

588-4 General Statistics

654-2 Meth. in Assessment of Soc. Structures

691-3 Multivariate Analysis

Mathematics

205-3 Math. for Social Scientists I

206-3 Math. for Social Scientists II

Computing Science

551-3 Computer Applic. in Behavioral Sci.

A B C D E I

Sociology

A B C D E I

505-2 Proseminar in Sociology I

506-2 Proseminar in Sociology II

507-2 Seminar in Research Methods I

Philosophy

542-3 Philosophy of Science

II. Evaluation of the Graduate Research Training Program

Please respond to the following statements, selecting one response based on the following key: SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), ? (Undecided), D (Disagree), SD (Strongly Disagree).

	SA	A	?	D	SD	Comments
1. The objectives of this program are clear to me.						
2. The objectives of this program are not realistic.						
3. The participants accept the purposes of this program.						
4. The objectives of this program are not the same as my objectives.						
5. I have not learned much new since being in the program.						
6. The program has made possible a degree of research competence that would not have been otherwise possible for me.						
7. The program has had little effect on other graduate students in the School of Education.						
8. We work together well as a group.						
9. The informal group interaction is valuable.						
10. There is little time for informal conversation.						
11. My time is being well spent.						
12. The program is meeting my expectations.						
13. Too much time is devoted to trivial matters.						
14. The program should be more flexible to meet individual needs.						
15. The research training core courses are relevant to the program's objectives.						
16. The importance that I attach to research and evaluation in education has greatly increased.						

	SA	A	?	D	SD	Comments
17. The role of research in my ultimate professional position will be increased markedly by this program.						
18. The internship experiences in the public schools are very valuable.						
19. Too much internship time is required for meeting the relevant objectives.						

III. Evaluation of LER in General

For each of the seven concepts below, mark one number (from 1 to 7) indicating your attitude toward the concept.

1. Concept: LER Fellows

Bright	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dull
Poorly motivated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Highly Motivated
Flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inflexible
Young	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Old

2. Concept: Physical Facilities (Rooms, Desks, etc.)

Inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Adequate
Convenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconvenient
Above Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Below Average

3. Concept: LER Directors

Approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unapproachable
Not Helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Helpful
Scholarly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Scholarly
Inflexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Flexible
Competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Incompent

4. Concept: Internship

Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Worthless
Too Much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Little
Essential	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Essential

5. Concept: Financial Support (Fellowship Stipends)

Too Little	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Much
Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair

6. Concept: LER Clients (Students and Faculty Served by LER)

Well Prepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Poorly Prepared
They Benefit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	They Don't Benefit
Ungrateful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Grateful

7. Concept: LER Core Curriculum

Too Much Math	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Little Math
Too Theoretical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Applied
Poorly Designed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Well Designed
Too Little Freedom	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Much Freedom

8. Rank order - from "1" highest to "6" lowest - the following post-doctoral activities on the basis of your own preference:

_____ Research in an R & D Center.
_____ Research in a Regional Laboratory.
_____ Director of research in a large city school system.
_____ Research and teaching in a small (less than 4,000) college or university.
_____ Research and teaching in a large (10,000+) university.
_____ Teaching only in a university.

9. Rank order - from "1" highest to "6" lowest - the following post-doctoral activities in terms of what you feel the LER Directors would like you to be doing when you finish.

_____ Research in an R & D Center.
_____ Research in a Regional Laboratory.
_____ Director of research in a large city school system.
_____ Research and teaching in a small (less than 4,000) college or university.
_____ Research and teaching in a large (10,000+) university.
_____ Teaching only in a university.

10. List the professional education or social science associations of which you became a member during the '66-'67 academic year:

11. Check the professional journals and periodicals which you read regularly:

_____ American Educational Research Journal
_____ Educational & Psychological Measurement
_____ Journal of Educational Measurement
_____ Journal of Educational Psychology
_____ Journal of Educational Research
_____ Phi Delta Kappan
_____ Psychological Bulletin
_____ Review of Educational Research
_____ Personnel and Guidance Journal

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION FACULTY
ON THE LABORATORY OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
1966-1967

We are gathering information to evaluate the operations of the Laboratory of Educational Research during the '66-'67 academic year (including summer sessions) and in order to plan for the current year. Your responses to the following questions will be appreciated. If you are new on the faculty, undoubtedly you will not be able to respond to these questions. When you have completed this questionnaire, please return it unsigned to the mailbox of either Gene Glass or Ken Hopkins. Thank you.

1. a. Have you personally used the services or facilities of the Laboratory of Educational Research (LER)?

   Yes
   No

   b. If "Yes," how often?

   c. If "Yes," for what purpose or in what manner?

2. a. How many of your advisees used the services or facilities of LER?

   b. If one or more of your advisees did use LER services, in what manner or for what purpose were they used?

3. a. Did you attend any special presentations or meetings arranged and conducted by LER during the '66-'67 academic year?

   Yes
   No

   b. If "Yes," approximately how many?

4. Do you feel that the activities and objectives of LER are helping to meet the research needs of the School of Education as identified in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Research, Measurement, and Statistics and the 1965 School of Education Self-Study:

   Yes
   No

The LER trainees for the period indicated were as follows:

Glenn Bracht	Ralph Hakstian
Ann Brickner	Lyle Knudson
Russell Chadbourn	Percy Peckham
Scott Harrington	Robert Smith

Please indicate Strong Agreement (SA), Agreement (A), Indecision (?), Disagreement (D), or Strong Disagreement (SD) to each of the following statements as they apply to the above LER trainees. (If you know none of these students, omit #5 - #8).

	SA	A	?	D	SD
5. They seem not to have an adequate interest in education.					
6. They do not seem to be willing to give assistance to other graduate students on research and evaluation problems.					
7. They are primarily interested in statistics (as opposed to testing, educ. psych., counseling, math educ., etc.).					
8. They seem to have the qualities needed to be effective as:					
a. university professors					
b. public school research workers					

Please mark either SA, A, ?, D, or SD for each of the following statements as they pertain to the operations of LER.

	SA	A	?	D	SD
9. LER should tutor Education graduate students having difficulty in statistics courses.					
10. LER has been successful in improving the quality of research performed in the School of Education					
a. by graduate students					
b. by faculty					

SA A ? D SD

11. LER is not being of service to the public schools of Colorado.

12. In training graduate students, LER is placing too much emphasis on research and not enough on learning about other areas of education.

13. If I had a question pertaining to research design, measurement, statistics, or computer use, I would be reluctant to consult LER for assistance.

14. Please suggest ways in which LER could be of greater service to the research efforts of the entire School of Education (including faculty, graduate students, etc.):

DOCUMENT 2

Instruments Used in the 1968-69 LER Evaluation Report

Laboratory of Educational Research

Key: SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), ? (Undecided), D (Disagree), SD (Strongly Disagree).

The following statements apply to the LER Graduate Research Training Program for the period September 1968 to September 1969.

			Comments
1.	The objectives of the program were clear to me.	SA A ? D SD	
2.	The objectives of the program were not realistic.	SA A ? D SD	
3.	The participants accepted the purposes of this program.	SA A ? D SD	
4.	The objectives of the program were not the same as my objectives.	SA A ? D SD	
5.	I did not learn much new during this period.	SA A ? D SD	
6.	The program made possible a degree of research competence that would not have been otherwise possible for me.	SA A ? D SD	
7.	The program had little effect on other graduate students in the school of Education.	SA A ? D SD	
8.	We worked well together as a group.	SA A ? D SD	
9.	The informal group interaction was valuable.	SA A ? D SD	
10.	There was little time for informal conversation.	SA A ? D SD	
11.	My time was well spent.	SA A ? D SD	
12.	The program met my expectations.	SA A ? D SD	
13.	Too much time was devoted to trivial matters.	SA A ? D SD	
14.	The program should have been more flexible to meet individual needs.	SA A ? D SD	
15.	The research training core courses were relevant to the program's objectives.	SA A ? D SD	

Comments

16. The internship experiences outside of the university were very valuable. SA A ? D SD

17. Too much intership time was required for meeting the relevant objectives. SA A ? D SD

18. I was asked to read too many irrelevant books and papers which are circulated through the Lab. SA A ? D SD

19. I resented having to assist graduate students with their course work. SA A ? D SD

Questionnaire on Laboratory of Educational Research

1. Concept: LER Fellows

Bright	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dull
Poorly Motivated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Highly Motivated
Flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inflexible
Ambitious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Lazy
Young	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Old

2. Concept: Physical Facilities a) (For personal academic work)

Inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Adequate
Convenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconvenient
Above Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Below Average

b) (For consulting assignments)

Inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Adequate
Convenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconvenient
Above Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Below Average

3. Concept: Equipment for Data Analysis

Inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Adequate
Convenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconvenient
Above Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Below Average

4. Concept: Library of Reference Materials

Inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Adequate
Convenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconvenient
Above Average	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Below Average

5. Concept: LER Directors

Approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Approachable
Not Helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Helpful
Scholarly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Scholarly
Competent Administrators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Incompetent Administrators
Respected Personally	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Respected Personally

6. Concept: Fellowship Stipends

Too Little	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Much
Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair

7. Concept: Financial Support (Professional activities e.g. travel to conventions)

Too Little	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Much
Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair

8. Concept: LER Core Curriculum

Too Much Math	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Little Math
Too Theoretical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Applied
Poorly Designed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Well Designed
Too Little Freedom	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Much Freedom

9. Concept: Seminar Speakers (From other schools, campuses, etc.)

Too Often	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Often Enough
Interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninteresting
Beneficial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Beneficial

10. Concept: LER Clients (Students and Faculty Served by LER)

Well Prepared	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Poorly Prepared
They Benefit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	They Don't Benefit
Ungrateful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Grateful

11. Concept: Internship Supervision

Too Closely Supervised	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Enough Supervision
Assignments Clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Assignments Unclear
Insufficient Time Given for Tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Enough Time Given for Tasks

12. Concept: Internship

Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Worthless
Too Much	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Little
Essential	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Essential
Conducive to Individual Research	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Conducive to Individual Research

13. The list below contains some of the kinds of activities and tasks that LER Fellows might perform as part of their internship duties. Please respond to each item in the list in the two ways listed below:

FIRST
Check frequency of occurrence for each activity

SECOND
Check appropriate value you attach to each task, whether or not you were called upon to perform it.

Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never		Had Great Value	Had Some Value	Had Little or no Value
				Led Student LER Discussion (Brown Sack, Special Seminar)			
				Helped with research budgets			
				Assisted in administrative duties			
				Took minutes in meetings			
				Planned and arranged seminars or?			
				Attended professional meetings			
				Assisted with supervisor's professional correspondence			
				Helped draft or edit supervisor's publications			
				Filled out questionnaires for supervisor received from outside of Lab.			
				Designed a research study			
				Reviewed and/or abstracted literature on a topic			
				Conceptualized a research problem			
				Assisted in other conceptual activities			
				Wrote a research proposal			
				Designed statistical analysis			
				Wrote computer programs			
				Conducted Experiments			
				Constructed research instruments			
				Administered or scored research instruments			
				Collected data in other ways			
				Assisted in actual teaching of courses			
				Read or graded papers			
				Administered or scored classroom exams			
				Assisted in preparing lectures or speeches for supervisor			
				Did typing, filing, and/or answering telephones			
				Did collating, duplicating, tallying, and/or bookkeeping			
				Used calculator for data analysis			
				Made tables, graphs, or charts			
				Coded and/or tabulated data			
				Keypunched and/or verified data			
				Submitted data for computer analysis			
				Used other computer-related equipment			
				Interpreted data			
				Helped write up final research report			
				Wrote research article			
				Gave a research paper			
				Set up physical facilities for conferences or lectures			
				Assisted supervisor with personal matters			
				Engaged in manual labor (moving furniture, etc.)			
				Gathered data for thesis or dissertation			
Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never		Had Great Value	Had Some Value	Had Little or no Value

14. Name the three persons who, in your opinion, appeared to make the greatest progress toward the objectives of this program during '68-'69:

Not Reported-- For Internal Use Only

Most progress:_____

Next most progress:_____

Third most progress:_____

15. Name the three persons who, in your opinion, appeared to attain the highest level of competence by the end of '68-'69:

Not Reported-- For Internal Use Only

Highest:_____

Next highest:_____

Third highest:_____

16. Rank order--from "1" highest to "6" lowest--the following post-doctoral activities on the basis of your own preference:

Rank	Activity
____	Research in an R & D Center.
____	Research in a Regional Laboratory.
____	Director of research in a large city school system.
____	Research and teaching in a small (less than 4,000) college or university.
____	Research and teaching in a large (10,000+) university.
____	Teaching only in a university.

17. Rank order--from "1" highest to "6" lowest--the following post-doctoral activities in terms of what you feel the LER Directors would like you to be doing when you finish:

Rank	Activity
____	Research in an R & D Center
____	Research in a Regional Laboratory.
____	Director of research in a large city school system.
____	Research and teaching in a small (less than 4,000) college or university.
____	Research and teaching in a large (10,000+) university.
____	Teaching only in a university.

18. List any professional education or social science associations of which you became a member during the '68-'69 academic year:

19. Check the professional journals and periodicals which you read regularly:

____ American Educational Research Journal
____ Biometrics
____ Biometrika
____ Educational & Psych. Meas.
____ Harvard Educational Review
____ Journal of Applied Psychology
____ Journal of Education
____ Journal of Educational Measurement
____ Journal of Educational Psychology
____ Journal of Educational Research
____ Journal of Experimental Education
____ Phi Delta Kappan
____ Psychological Bulletin
____ Psychological Review
____ Psychometrika
____ Review of Educational Research
____ Teachers College Record
____ Others (specify)

20. A major concern at the LER is to find ways of improving the preparation of educational researchers through optimizing experiences provided to fellows. We would appreciate your frank and serious suggestions regarding ways to improve the LER program. We are interested both in suggestions for new procedures and critiques of existing procedures. Please use the space below for your response.

DOCUMENT 3

Instruments Used in the

1969-70 LER Evaluation Report

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO FELLOWS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1969-1970 *

Please answer the following 27 questions; most require only circling a number on a value scale. Your comments are welcome.

1. Please rank the following ten activities according to their educational value for you.

Activity	Rank	Emphasis	COMMENTS (see question #2)
1. Brown sack seminars	____	_____	
2. Comprehensive exams (both sets)	____	_____	
3. Consulting: faculty-directed projects such as Title I or Task Force	____	_____	
4. Consulting: off-the-street	____	_____	
5. Course work	____	_____	
6. Dissertation	____	_____	
7. Faculty-fellow interactions (informal; collaboration on faculty-initiated projects)	____	_____	
8. Fellow-fellow interactions (bullpen activities)	____	_____	
9. Independent study or reading	____	_____	
10. Self-initiated projects (independent or in collaboration with other fellows, with or without faculty advice)	____	_____	

2. Please rate (in the Emphasis column) the above 10 activities according to this key:

+ I overemphasized it in '69-'70

0 I emphasized it correctly in '69-'70

- I underemphasized it in '69-'70

N. A. Not applicable

*Please return completed questionnaire to Nancy Burton, Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO FELLOWS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1969-1970

COMMENTS

The next four questions refer to individual faculty members and will not be used for USOE evaluation but will be held in confidence; they are for in-house evaluation.

Please circle the name of the faculty member who was your dissertation adviser. KEY: H = Hopkins, G = Glass, W = Worthen, Other (specify) _____.

3. It was difficult to see him about professional questions. (Circle only for applicable faculty.)

	strongly agree					strongly disagree
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

4. Guidance for course and degree planning was: (Circle only for applicable faculty.)

	restrictive					vague
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

5. Dissertation guidance was: (Circle only for applicable faculty.)

	restrictive					vague
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

6. I gained a great deal professionally through informal interaction with:

	strongly agree					strongly disagree
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

7. LER faculty should know more about School of Education and Graduate School requirements.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

8. Social contacts between LER fellows and faculty should:

increase 1 2 3 4 5 decrease

9. Social contacts among LER fellows should:

increase 1 2 3 4 5 decrease

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO FELLOWS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1969-70

COMMENTS

Please check year you entered LER: 68__, 69__, 70__

10. Older fellows helped orient new fellows in 1969: a great deal 1 2 3 4 5 very little

11. I received help from other fellows on: often seldom

course work	1	2	3	4	5	
course planning	1	2	3	4	5	
degree requirements	1	2	3	4	5	
professional problems	1	2	3	4	5	
client problems	1	2	3	4	5	

12. Informal interaction with LER fellows was: valuable 1 2 3 4 5 not valuable

13. Please rate the following changes made in LER procedures during '69-'70.

a. Making a fellow the coordinator of client appointments. success 1 2 3 4 5 failure

b. Making a fellow the coordinator of brown sack seminars. 1 2 3 4 5

c. Requiring 600 (rather than 400) hours of internship. 1 2 3 4 5

d. Having a faculty member sit in on client intake interviews. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Clients of LER were:

a. well-prepared	1	2	3	4	5	ill-prepared
b. benefitted	1	2	3	4	5	not benefitted
c. grateful	1	2	3	4	5	ungrateful

15. On client's projects which were too difficult for them to design and analyze, I found myself assuming much of the work. agree 1 2 3 4 5 disagree

16. The professional preparation of the LER program met my expectations. agree 1 2 3 4 5 disagree

17. Physical facilities of the LER in 1969-70 were: adequate 1 2 3 4 5 inadequate

18. Stipends were: adequate 1 2 3 4 5 inadequate

Internship (generally) was: relevant 1 2 3 4 5 busywork

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO FELLOWS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1969-1970

COMMENTS

19. How many _____ know well acquainted with

a. Education graduate students (non-LER) _____ _____

b. Professors in School of Education (non-LER) _____ _____

20. LER needs closer ties with the School of Education. strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

21. Please list major projects (e.g., Title I, ESCP) on which you worked in 1969-70 (spent more than 20 hours).

22. Please list any papers, publications, and research projects completed or in progress in 1969-70.

	Completed	In Progress
a. Collaboration with LER faculty		
b. Collaboration with LER fellows		
c. Collaboration with students in School of Education		
d. Collaboration with others (specify whom)		
e. By self		

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO FELLOWS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1969-70

COMMENTS

23. Please list your professional activities (committee memberships, professional memberships, meetings attended, etc.) for 1969-70.

LER _____

School of Education _____

Professional _____

Other _____

24. Please list at least 3 highlights of the 1969-70 year: projects, brown-sackers, speakers, etc.

_____

_____

25. Please list any deficiencies in the LER program which you perceive, or any deficiencies in your professional preparation, or any suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO FELLOWS OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1969-70

COMMENTS

26. Evaluation of courses taken in 1969-70.

Core courses

Course name	Instructor	useful				useless	excellent				poor	instruction
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	

Other courses

		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	

27. Degree steps

	When completed	Pass (check)	No pass (check)
1. Language exam			
2. First comps			
3. Second comps			
4. Dissertation proposal			
5. Dissertation writing			
6. Oral			

LER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FACULTY OF LER 1969-70

1. Please rank the following ten activities according to their educational value for the LER fellows.

Activity	Rank	Emphasis (see question #2)	COMMENTS
1. Brown sack seminars	____	_____	
2. Comprehensive exams (both sets)	____	_____	
3. Consulting: faculty-directed projects such as Title I or Task Force	____	_____	
4. Consulting: off-the-street	____	_____	
5. Course work	____	_____	
6. Dissertation	____	_____	
7. Faculty-fellow interactions (informal; collaboration on faculty-initiated projects)	____	_____	
8. Fellow-fellow interactions (bullpen activities)	____	_____	
9. Independent study or reading	____	_____	
10. Self-initiated projects (independent or in collaboration with other fellows; with or without faculty advice)	____	_____	

2. Please rate (in the Emphasis column) the above 10 activities according to this key:

+ Overemphasized in 1969-70

0 Emphasized correctly in 1969-70

- Underemphasized in 1969-70

D. K. Don't know

LER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FACULTY OF LER 1969-70

3. Please list major projects (e.g., Title I, ESCP) on which you worked in 1969-70 (spent more than 20 hours).

LER _____

_____

_____

Non-LER _____

_____

_____

4. Please list any papers, publications, and research projects completed or in progress in 1969-70 (attach separate sheet if necessary).

	Completed	In Progress
a. Collaboration with LER faculty		
b. Collaboration with LER fellows		
c. Collaboration with students in School of Education		
d. Collaboration with others (specify whom)		
e. By self		

LER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FACULTY OF LER 1969-70

5. Please list your professional activities (committee memberships, professional memberships, meetings attended, etc.) for 1969-70. COMMENTS

LER _____

School of Education _____

Professional _____

Other _____

6. Please list at least 3 highlights of the 1969-70 year: projects, brown-sackers speakers, etc.

_____

_____

7. Please list any deficiencies in the LER program which you perceive, or any deficiencies in ~~fellows'~~ professional preparation, or any suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. LER fellows asked for too much of my time on questions they should have answered independently. strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

9. The fellows need more faculty (not necessarily LER) supervision on their dissertations. strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

10. I have gained a great deal from informal (professional) interactions with LER fellows. strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

LER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FACULTY OF LER 1969-70

COMMENTS

11. What percent of your total work time was devoted to LER? _____%

12. What percent of your total work time was devoted to School of Education duties (excluding LER duties above)? _____%

NOTE: 11 + 12 should not total 100%.

13. The physical facilities of LER are — adequate 1 2 3 4 5 inadequate

14. New fellows would benefit from more faculty-directed orientation to the lab. — strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

15. The fellows would benefit from more faculty guidance in their course and degree planning. — strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

16. Please rate the following changes made in LER procedures during 1969-70 and, if possible, comment on the reason for the changes.

a. Making a fellow the coordinator of client appointments. — success 1 2 3 4 5 failure

b. Making a fellow the coordinator of brown sack seminars. — 1 2 3 4 5

c. Requiring 600 (rather than 400) hours of internship. — 1 2 3 4 5

d. Having a faculty member sit in on client intake interviews. — 1 2 3 4 5

17. On the whole, clients benefitted from consultation with LER personnel. — strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

LER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FACULTY OF LER 1969-70

COMMENTS

18. Approximately how many hours did you spend with non-LER members of the faculty of education in 1969-70?

    a. on research-related projects _____

    b. on School of Education meetings and projects _____

    c. others (please specify) _____ _____

    _____ _____

19. LER should try for a closer association with the School of Education. strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

LER CLIENT OPINIONAIRE

Two major objectives of the Laboratory of Educational Research (LER) are 1) to provide consulting services for people with problems in measurement, evaluation, and statistical design and analysis and 2) to train LER interns.

The purpose of the opinionaire is to determine how well these objectives are being met and how to improve these services. Please respond to the following questions by circling the appropriate numbers. A space is also provided for your comments and criticisms.

COMMENTS

1. The procedures for getting an appointment for consultation were:
   clear 1 2 3 4 5 unclear
   convenient 1 2 3 4 5 inconvenient

2. The kinds of services offered by LER were:
   clear before I came 1 2 3 4 5 unclear before I came
   clear after I came 1 2 3 4 5 unclear after I came

3. The advice given to me was:
   clear 1 2 3 4 5 confusing
   competent 1 2 3 4 5 incompetent
   efficiently given 1 2 3 4 5 inefficiently given

4. The consultation services:
   taught me a great deal 1 2 3 4 5 taught me nothing
   improved my research project 1 2 3 4 5 interfered with my project

5. The attitude of LER personnel toward my project was:
   encouraging 1 2 3 4 5 discouraging
   respectful 1 2 3 4 5 condescending
   open-minded 1 2 3 4 5 rigid

6. The LER personnel used technical language I was unable to understand:
   frequently 1 2 3 4 5 seldom

7. I received enough direction to carry out the advice on my own.
   strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

8. The scheduling of meetings interfered with my project schedule.
   strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

9. I had to spend excessive time re-explaining my project each time I met with LER consultants.
   strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE LABORATORY OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

We are gathering information to evaluate the operations of the Laboratory of Educational Research during the '69-'70 academic year (including summer sessions) and in order to plan for the current year. Your responses to the following questions will be appreciated. If you are new on the faculty, undoubtedly you will not be able to respond to these questions. When you have completed this questionnaire, please return it unsigned to the mailbox of Blaine Worthen.

Thank you.

COMMENTS

1. Have you personally used the consulting services of the Laboratory of Educational Research (LER)? (If NO, go to question #2.)

   YES 1 NO 2

   b. How many times?

   1 2 3 4 more than 4

   c. With whom did you consult? (Faculty = 1; Fellows = 2)

   1 2

   d. How would you rate the service received?

   Excellent 1 2 3 4 5 Poor

   e. For what purpose or in what manner did you use the services?

   _____

2. Have any of your advisees used the consulting services of LER? (If NO, go to question #3.)

   YES 1 NO 2

   b. How many of your advisees used the services of LER in '69-'70?

   _____

   c. How would you rate the services they received?

   Excellent 1 2 3 4 5 Poor

   d. For what purpose did they consult LER?

   Dissertation ____ Class project ____
   M.A. thesis ____ Independent project ____
   Other _____

3. Did you have some advisees doing research whom you purposely did not send to LER? If so, why?

   YES 1 NO 2

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE LABORATORY OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

COMMENTS

4. The LER trainees for the period indicated were as follows:

Bob Ahrens	Jim Collins	Susan Oldefendt
Dan Bauman	Steve Jurs	Rory Remer
Dick Bennet	Bob Mendro	Todd Rogers
Nancy Burton	Jon Morris	Jim Sanders

a. Check those with whom you are acquainted.

b. The students checked above were generally of what status on the following:

	above average					below average
i. Academic ability	1	2	3	4	5	
ii. Class participation	1	2	3	4	5	
iii. Possession of practical knowledge about public school education	1	2	3	4	5	

5. The LER faculty consists of the following persons: Gene Glass, Blaine Worthen, Ken Hopkins. Rate the LER faculty in general on the following.

	above average					below average
a. Participation in School of Education activities	1	2	3	4	5	
b. Contribution to prestige of School of Education	1	2	3	4	5	
c. Contribution to general field of education	1	2	3	4	5	
d. Collaboration with School of Education on common problems related to education	1	2	3	4	5	

	strongly agree					strongly disagree
6. If I had a question pertaining to research design, measurement, statistics, or computer use, I would consult LER for assistance.	1	2	3	4	5	

7. Please suggest ways in which LER could be of greater service to the efforts of the entire School of Education (research and otherwise, including faculty, graduate students, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

DOCUMENT 4

Instruments Used in the

Summer, 1973 LER

Summative Evaluation

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO PAST AND PRESENT FELLOWS; SUMMER, 1973*

Respondent _____ Present Position and Location _____

Please answer the following 44 questions; most require only circling a number on a value scale. Your comments on any item are welcome. (We ask for your name only to enhance our chances of obtaining complete returns; your specific responses will, of course, be kept confidential.)

1. Please rank the following ten activities according to your present opinion of their educational value for you. (Give a rank of 1 to the activity of most value, etc.)

Activity	Rank	Emphasis	COMMENTS
1. Brown Sack seminars.	___	_____	
2. Comprehensive exams.	___	_____	
3. Consulting: faculty-directed projects such as Title I, Task Force, State Assessment, or Title III evaluations.	___	_____	
4. Consulting: off-the-street (other-than-LER graduate students and faculty; that is, from Education and other disciplines).	___	_____	
5. Course work.	___	_____	
6. Dissertation.	___	_____	
7. Faculty-fellow interactions (informal; collaboration on faculty-initiated projects).	___	_____	
8. Fellow-fellow interactions (bullpen activities).	___	_____	
9. Independent study or reading.	___	_____	
10. Self-initiated projects (independent or in collaboration with other fellows, with or without faculty advice).	___	_____	

2. Please rate (in the Emphasis column) the above 10 activities according to this key.

+ I overemphasized it during my LER years.

0 I emphasized it correctly during my LER years.

- I underemphasized it during my LER years.

N.A. Not applicable.

* Please return completed questionnaire to Dr. William L. Goodwin, Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado. Please return as soon as possible and no later than Sept. 7. Please include a current vita.

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO PAST AND PRESENT FELLOWS; SUMMER, 1973

The next four questions refer to individual faculty members; your responses will be held in confidence.

Please circle the name of the faculty member who was your dissertation adviser. KEY: H = Hopkins, G = Glass, W = Worthen, Other (specify) _____.

COMMENTS

3. It was difficult to see him about professional questions. (Circle only for applicable faculty.)

	strongly agree					strongly disagree
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

4. Guidance for course and degree planning was: (Circle only for applicable faculty.)

	restrictive					vague
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

5. Dissertation guidance was : (Circle only for applicable faculty.)

	restrictive					vague
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (Specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

6. I gained a great deal professionally through informal interaction with:

	strongly agree					strongly disagree
H	1	2	3	4	5	
G	1	2	3	4	5	
W	1	2	3	4	5	
Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	

7. LER faculty should know more about School of Education and Graduate School requirements.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 strongly disagree

8. Social contacts between LER fellows and faculty should:

increase 1 2 3 4 5 decrease

9. Social contacts among LER fellows should:

increase 1 2 3 4 5 decrease

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO PAST AND PRESENT FELLOWS; SUMMER, 1973

Please check the year you entered LER: 66___, 67___, 68___, 69___, 70___, 71___, 72___

10. Older fellows helped orient new fellows: a great deal 1 2 3 4 5 very little COMMENTS

11. I received help from other fellows on: often seldom

course work	1	2	3	4	5	
course planning	1	2	3	4	5	
degree requirements	1	2	3	4	5	
professional problems	1	2	3	4	5	
client problems	1	2	3	4	5	

12. Informal interaction with LER fellows was: valuable 1 2 3 4 5 not valuable

13. Please rate the following changes made in LER procedures. (Circle NK if you have no knowledge of the change.)

a. Making a fellow the coordinator of client appointments. (success / good idea ... failure / poor idea)	1	2	3	4	5	
b. Making a fellow the coordinator of brown sack seminars.	1	2	3	4	5	
c. Requiring 400 (rather than 600) hours of internship.	1	2	3	4	5	
d. Having a faculty member sit in on client intake interviews.	1	2	3	4	5	

14. Clients of LER were:

a. well-prepared	1	2	3	4	5	ill-prepared
b. benefitted	1	2	3	4	5	not benefitted
c. grateful	1	2	3	4	5	ungrateful

15. On client's projects which were too difficult for them to design and analyze, I found myself assuming much of the work. agree 1 2 3 4 5 disagree

16. The professional preparation of the LER program met my expectations. agree 1 2 3 4 5 disagree

17. Physical facilities of the LER were: adequate 1 2 3 4 5 inadequate

18. Stipends were: adequate 1 2 3 4 5 inadequate

Internship (generally) was: relevant 1 2 3 4 5 busywork

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO PAST AND PRESENT FELLOWS; SUMMER, 1973

19. How many _____

	know well	acquainted with	COMMENTS
a. Education graduate students (non-LER)	_____	_____	
b. Professors in School of Education (non-LER)	_____	_____	

20. LER needs closer ties with the School of Education. Strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree

21. Please list major projects (e.g., Title I, State Assessment, Task Force, Title III evaluations, etc.) on which you worked (i.e., spent more than 40 hours) during your years at LER.

22. Please list titles and dates of any papers, publications, and research projects completed (or in progress) while you were a LER fellow. (Use reverse side if more space is necessary.)

	Completed		In Progress	
	Title	Date	Title	Date
a. Collaboration with LER faculty				
b. Collaboration with LER fellows				
c. Collaboration with students in School of Education				
d. Collaboration with others (specify whom)				
e. By self				

LER QUESTIONNAIRE TO PAST AND PRESENT FELLOWS; SUMMER, 1973

23. Please list your present professional memberships and activities (national offices held, national or regional committees served on, etc.) within those organizations.

COMMENTS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Please rank order at least 5 major highlights of your LER years; e.g., projects, publications, specific guest professors, etc. (Give rank "1" to the highlight considered most important, etc.)

Rank 1 _____

Rank 2 _____

Rank 3 _____

Rank 4 _____

Rank 5 _____

25. The LER "Core Curriculum" in research methodology and statistics contained (or was):

too much math 1 2 3 4 5 too little math
too theoretical 1 2 3 4 5 too applied
poorly designed 1 2 3 4 5 well designed
too little freedom 1 2 3 4 5 too much freedom

26. Considering your present perspective and role (or role-plans), do you feel that the LER curriculum contains too much or too little emphasis on evaluation methodology (as distinct from research methodology):

too much emphasis on evaluation 1 2 3 4 5 too little emphasis on evaluation.

27. Assume that all constraints were removed and you could now take a new position (or retain your present one, if that were your choice). Rank order in the left column below from "1" highest to "9" lowest the following occupations on the basis of your own preference for them:

COMMENTS

27. Your Own Rank	Occupation	28. LER Directors' Rank
_____	Research and development in a private or quasi-public firm (e.g., National Assessment, ETS, SRI).	_____
_____	Research and development in a Regional Laboratory.	_____
_____	Research and development in an R & D Center.	_____
_____	Research and teaching in a small (less than 4,000) college or university.	_____
_____	Research and teaching in a large (10,000+) university.	_____
_____	Research director in a large city school system.	_____
_____	Coordinator for a state education department.	_____
_____	Research on an independent, free-lance basis (i.e., self-employed researcher taking contracts of interest, but not one who is university -- or organization -- based).	_____
_____	Teaching only in a university.	_____

28. Rank order -- from "1" highest to "9" lowest -- the occupations in item 27 in the right column on the basis of what you feel the LER Directors would like you to prefer.

29. Items 27 and 28 assume, for the most part, that you would prefer an occupation that includes a heavy research component. This may not be the case. Rank order -- from "1" highest to "3" lowest -- the following areas in terms of your preference for working in them.

Rank	Area
____	Development
____	Evaluation
____	Research

COMMENTS

30. To what extent do you feel that the LER program -- faculty and fellows -- has influenced (in a positive sense) the following groups:

a. School of Education graduate students. Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 To a great extent

b. School of Education Faculty. Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 To a great extent

c. University of Colorado graduate students and faculty outside the school of education. Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 To a great extent

31. Estimate the percent of your total time with LER that you spent (note: in the item, "consulting" does not include running or programming data-analysis computer routines):

____% Consulting with education graduate students.

____% Consulting with education faculty.

____% Consulting with non-education graduate students.

____% Consulting with non-education faculty.

____% Programming or running data-analysis computer routines for LER clients (as distinguished from, for your own studies).

32. Had the LER training model been focused primarily around a continuing large-scale research project experience for trainees (rather than as it was), do you feel that you would have been:

better trained overall 1 2 3 4 5 poorer trained overall

33. To what extent do you feel weakly, poorly, or inadequately trained in a specific discipline or content area (as distinct from training in research methodology/statistics content)?

to a great extent 1 2 3 4 5 not at all

34. In your present occupational role, compared to your non-LER colleagues, how would you rate yourself?

superiorly trained overall 1 2 3 4 5 inferiorly trained overall

35. To what extent do you believe that your answer in #34 is due to your LER program training (as distinct from being due to other training, self training, etc.)?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 to a great extent

COMMENTS

36. Speculate as to how "successful" you would now consider yourself had you taken a graduate program other than that offered by LER ("successful" in an overall, general sense, including occupational role, life style, etc.).

less successful than I now feel 1 2 3 4 5 More successful than I now feel

37. a. To what extent do you feel the need for <u>further training</u>, at this point in time?

to a great extent 1 2 3 4 5 Not at all

b. Specify, in rank order, those areas in which you most feel the need for <u>further training</u> (rank as "1" your highest need, etc.):

Rank 1 _____

Rank 2 _____

Rank 3 _____

38. To what extent do you feel the need for <u>retraining</u> (i.e., training in a new field), at this point in time?

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 to a great extent

39. To what extent do you believe that it is important for LER students to publish formal papers <u>during</u> their training program?

to a great extent 1 2 3 4 5 not at all

40. To what extent do you believe that <u>you</u> have produced research critical for the field?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 to a great extent

41. To what extent do you believe that <u>you</u> are working in major problematic areas in education today (i.e., integration, alternative schooling, accountability, etc.)?

to a great extent 1 2 3 4 5 Not at all

42. Overall, how would you rate the LER training program compared to other training programs in the same area (i.e., research methodology and statistics)?

COMMENTS

distinctly inferior 1 2 3 4 5 distinctly superior

43. Overall, how would you rate the LER training program compared to other doctoral programs generally (i.e., in all fields)?

distinctly inferior 1 2 3 4 5 distinctly superior

44. Please describe any deficiencies that you perceive in the LER program, as well as any suggestions that you have for improvement of the LER program.

Please return completed questionnaire to Dr. William L. Goodwin, Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado. Please return as soon as possible and no later than Sept. 7. Please include a current vita.

QUESTION SETS USED WITH LER PRINCIPAL STAFF; FALL, 1973

A-1 : Over the seven-year history of LER, there have been several drop-outs; is it possible for you to characterize the drop-outs as a group (i.e., did they have common characteristics)?

A-2 : For several of the early years of the Lab, monies were received to develop the research methodology program. Comment upon the present program as compared to the situation existing before LER was initiated.

A-3 : Has the effort you have expended in developing and operating the LER model been worth it or not? Elaborate.

A-4 : Rank order the importance or weight of the following LER entrance criteria. (Give a rank of 1 to the most important, etc.)

1) GPA
2) GRE
3) Math background
4) Commitment to educational research
5) Endorsement from known, reliable source

A-5 : Do the high entrance criterion for LER students have any undesirable consequences?

A-6 : To what extent do you feel the students of the School of Education have been influenced by LER? Be specific in detailing examples of this influence.

A-7 : To what extent do you feel the faculty and students in departments other than education have been influenced by LER? Be specific in detailing examples of this influence.

A-8 : Comment on how you would view the following in terms of appropriateness for the LER training model:

1) a large scale research project in which students could be actively involved.
2) increased internships with "applied" agencies, that is, public schools, state departments, and the like.

A-9 : Should LER students be required to do a small research project from conceptualization to completion?

A-10: How important is it that LER fellows teach while earning the Ph.D.?

A-11: Do you view the LER student of today, as compared with 1966, as taking more or fewer offerings in the various behavioral sciences?

A-12: At one point, internships were reduced from 600 to 400 hours. What do you view as the benefits and consequences of this change?

A-13: Have you noticed a shift in where LER graduates are employed?

A-14: Assuming that the current trend toward difficulty in finding student support funds continues, what effect do you predict this will have on the LER program and students?

A-15: To what extent do you feel that LER students are handicapped by their lack of concentration in a substantive area (i.e., an area other than research methodology itself)?

A-16: To what extent are LER students in touch with the major problematic areas in education today (i.e., integration, alternative schooling, accountability, etc.)?

A-17: In your opinion, and considering similar programs to LER across the country, how would you rank the LER program in terms of its contribution to the field of educational research?

A-18: To what extent do you feel that LER graduates have or will become leaders in the field of educational research, broadly conceived? (Be specific, that is, how many do you feel will attain what level of prominence?)

A-19: What do you perceive as the greatest weakness of LER? The second greatest weakness?

B-1 : At the outset of LER in 1966, it was envisioned that several departments, other than education, would be meaningfully involved in the LER student's program. To what extent do you feel such inter-disciplinary liaison has been achieved and also comment on the value of such liaison?

B-2 : Early in the life of LER, it was anticipated that there would be 24 students training at a single time in the Lab. If such a number had been attained, what do you view as the likely benefits and consequences?

B-3 : To what extent do you feel the success of the LER program has been dependent upon recruitment? Upon high entrance standards?

B-4 : To what extent do you see LER as being vulnerable to the charge of academic "elitism"? What positive aspects has such "elitism"? What negative aspects?

B-5 : Speculate on how successful LER students would have been after completing the Ph.D. if they had completed it in an area other than LER.

B-6 : To what extent do you feel that the internships (608, 609, 610, 611) are critical for the LER program?

B 7 : To what extent would you estimate LER students are involved in the following activities via their internships? Estimate for both early Lab (say, 1966-68) and late Lab (say, 1971-73).

1) Consulting with graduate students.
2) Consulting with faculty.
3) Running data analysis computer routines.

B-8 : Comment upon the nature of your personal involvement with your students, that is, its duration, its intensity, its merit, etc., particularly as compared to involvement with students displayed by other faculty.

B-9 : Trace the history of the brown sacks. Have they recently been what you want them to be?

B-10: To what extent do you feel the faculty of the School of Education have been influenced by LER? Be specific in detailing examples of this influence.

B-11: At times, the School of Education faculty have expressed concern about the accessibility of LER given its location in the Education Annex. Some have suggested that it be moved to Hellems Annex. What is your reaction to this suggestion?

B-12: Do you notice a trend in terms of the number of LER students who leave the program for employment before completing their dissertation?

B-13: To what extent do you perceive major changes in the competencies acquired by a LER student as he completes the Ph.D.?

B-14: Several students in reflection feel they would have gained via more time (i.e., another year) in LER. How do you feel?

B-15: Should LER students be involved in preparation of research proposals for funding?

B-16: To what extent do you feel that it is important for LER students to publish formal papers before completing the Ph.D.?

B-17: To what extent do you feel that the faculty and students of the LER have produced research critical for the field?

B-18: What would you view as LER's overall impact on the field of educational research? Estimate what LER's impact is likely to be 10 years from now.

B-19: What do you perceive as the greatest strength of LER. The second greatest strength?